REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

No claims are currently being cancelled.

Claims 14-16 are currently being amended.

Claim 19 is currently being added.

This amendment and reply adds and amends claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After adding and amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-19 are now pending in this application.

Prior Art Rejections:

In the final Office Action dated December 23, 2008, claims 1-4 and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0219127 to Russ et al. (hereinafter "Russ") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,502,191 to Smith; and claims 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russ in view of Smith and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,813,264 to Vassilovski. These rejections are traversed for at least the reasons given below.

Independent claim 1 recites that <u>an agency communication section has a virtual slave unit having the function of a slave unit</u> and a function of converting voice and data formats to go beyond a firewall, and the virtual slave unit executes communications by agency.

The final Office Action asserts that column 6, lines 23-41 of Smith discloses a delivery server acting as a slave unit for converting voice and data formats to go beyond the firewall. <u>However, as is clear from Figure 2 of Smith, in which text packets are submitted to a delivery server in step 235, a prior step 225 involves accessing an Internet Server, and thus the delivery server 235 is outside the firewall in which the sending computer is located.</u>

-6-

Thus, since the claimed agency communication section is equipped to the intranet, and since Smiths' delivery server is located outside the intranet, it cannot meet the specific features recited in claim 1. Column 5, lines 40-43 do not change the fact that the send client communicates with the delivery server outside of the intranet, and not within the intranet.

The Advisory Action dated April 30, 2009 asserts that "The Delivery Server and the Send Client software residing on the sending computer are connected via a bidirectional communication link or pipe called the HTTP Conduit. Therefore, Smiths delivery server is disclosed as being part of the Intranet."

In reply to this assertion made in the Advisory Action, the cited description in Smith, i.e. "The Delivery Server and the Send Client software residing on the sending computer are connected via a bidirectional communication link or pipe called the HTTP Conduit.", is just evidence that the delivery server is outside of the Intranet rather than part of the Intranet. As the delivery server is outside the Intranet, this server needs a communication pipe like an HTTP Conduit to connect to a sending computer located in the Intranet.

If the Smith's delivery server is regarded as part of the Intranet, this server should be protected by a firewall as with a slave unit of claim 1. Smith, however, teaches that the server is not protected by the firewall, as described, for example, in column 3, lines 61-62, which states that "The text packets are received by a server 20 outside the firewall which has been...".

Thus, since it is clear that Smith's Delivery Server is located outside the firewall and thus outside of the Intranet, it cannot correspond to a slave unit [located in an Intranet protected by a firewall] for converting voice and data formats to go beyond the firewall, as recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, presently pending independent claim 1 is patentable over the combined teachings of Russ and Smith.

Still further, with respect to dependent claims 14-16, the final Office Action asserts that paragraphs 90 to 92 on pages 9 and 10 of Russ describes that a slave unit has a mechanism for judging whether a slave unit is located inside or outside the firewall, in which the slave unit executes encryption if it is judged that the slave unit is located outside the

firewall or stopping the encryption if it is judged that the slave unit is located inside the firewall. Paragraph 90 of Russ describes that a process negotiates an encryption scheme with a client-receiver by using a classification of the client-receiver, which says nothing about whether or not the client-receiver is located within or outside of a firewall. Paragraph 91 of Russ describes that a client-receiver determines a level of encryption responsive to dynamic changes in a local area network, such as an amount of content delivered to the client-receiver. This says nothing about whether or not the client-receiver is judged to be located within or outside of a firewall. Paragraph 92 of Russ describes that the encryption scheme is determined dynamically responsive to the content type being transmitted to the receiver. Again, this says nothing about whether or not the client-receiver is judged to be located within or outside of a firewall.

It is noted that the Advisory Action does not address the above comments regarding claims 14-16 that are exactly the same as the ones provided in the previously-filed response, whereby, in event, claims 14-16 have been further amended to even more explicitly distinguish over the cited art of record.

Thus, dependent claims 14-16 are patentable over the cited art of record for these additional reasons.

Also, with respect to the rejection of dependent claim 17, the final Office Action asserts that column 6, lines 40-43 of Smith discloses a proxy server as an agency communication communicating with the client and the proxy as if it is another slave unit. Applicants respectfully disagree, since column 6, lines 40-43 of Smith describes that the send client opens an HTTP conduit with the delivery server and presents the session ID to initiate a file transfer transaction. There is nothing in this portion of Smith that teaches that the send client treats the delivery server as anything other than a delivery server, and certainly there is nothing in this portion of Smith that teaches that the send client treats the delivery server as a slave unit.

It is noted that the Advisory Action does not address the above comments regarding claim 17 that are exactly the same as the ones provided in the previously-filed response.

Therefore, dependent claim 17 is patentable for these additional reasons.

New Claim:

New claim 19 has been added to recite features regarding encryption and decryption of data as provided by way of a virtual slave unit, whereby such features are not taught or suggested by the cited art of record, when taken as a whole.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the final Office Action and the Advisory Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date ___6/22/2009___   By ___[signature]___

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP   George C. Beck
Customer Number: 22428   Registration No. 38,072
Telephone: (202) 672-5535
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399   Phillip J. Articola
                                        Registration No. 38,819

-9-